

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 19-20. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1, 6, 9-15 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winchell, *et al.* (US 2002/0151321) in view of Laursen, *et al.* (US 2001/0041556). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner rejection in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

The present invention deals with managing a multiple point-to-multipoint (PTM) services within a mobile communication network. Since there are multiple PTM services, the first step, as recited by independent Claim 1, is to receive a request from a mobile station to access a particular PTM service, wherein the request includes a subscriber identifier as well as a PTM service identifier for the desired PTM service. The next step is to define accounting information using that subscriber identifier with the identified PTM service identifier. This accounting information is then stored within a PTM service management entity. After enabling access to the mobile station, the accounting information is then provided to an accounting entity of the serving mobile communication network where the accounting information considers the total number of subscribers who placed the requested PTM service. As described in the patent application, for example, the more subscribers you have using a particular PTM service, the cheaper the rate everybody has to pay for that service. The Applicant submits that all of the novel and unobvious steps and limitations cited by independent Claims 1, 19, and 20 are not disclosed or taught by the cited references.

In Winchell, since it only talks about making a group call communications where there is only one service involved, there is no need for a mobile station to include the

service identifier in its request. Also, there is nothing in Winchell that shows that accounting takes into consideration the total number of subscribers that are involved in that requested feature. For example, Para 33, 39, 43, and 44 cited by the Examiner all fail to show a subscriber request including a PTM identifier. Also, para 37, 38, and 43 of Mitchell likewise fail to show the accounting scheme considering the total number of subscribers involved in the identified PTM service. The Examiner then stated that "Winchell failed to disclose defining accounting information associating said subscriber identifier with said point-to-multipoint service identifier and storing said accounting information placing the subscriber in association with the identified point-to-multipoint identification within a PTM service management entity." Applicant submits that further along the same line Mitchell likewise fails to provide accounting information in which accounting for the PTM service is performed considering the total number of subscribers who placed the request for accessing the PTM service. Lastly, Laursen discloses a "fleet management system" and the cited portions of Laursen disclose a mapping between the device ID and group ID within Laursen's fleet management system. However, Laursen also fails to disclose associating a subscriber identifier with a point-to-multipoint service identifier. In that regard, a PTM service identifier is different than identifying a particular group within a fleet management system. Furthermore, nothing in Laursen discloses or teaches the step of providing accounting information while considering the total number of subscribers who are using that particular PTM service.


For at least the reasons above, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending independent claims are allowable over the cited references. All other remaining claims are dependent on now allowable independent claims and recite additional limitations thereto. A Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Han
Registration No. 41,403

Date: October 7, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686
john.han@ericsson.com